



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,196	07/15/2003	Yehoshua Shachar	MNETEC.001A	2337
20995	7590	04/18/2007	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			APANIUS, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3736	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	04/18/2007		ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/18/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/621,196	SHACHAR, YEHO SHUA
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael Apanius	3736

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 39-43 and 45-47 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 39-43 and 45-47 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 3/8/2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All . b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/8/2007 has been entered.
2. The amendments to claims 39-41, 45 and 47; the cancellation of claims 1-38, 44 and 48-66; the amendments to the specification; and the replacement drawing sheets are acknowledged. Currently, claims 39-43 and 45-47 are pending.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference character that appear to not be mentioned in the description: for example, "929" in figure 13H; "800" in figure 17B; "610" and "611" in figure 18C.
4. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) and/or amendments to the specification in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate

prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains more than 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b). It is noted that the Applicant replaced and considerably shortened (by deleting seven paragraphs) the "Summary" section of the specification in the amendment of 7/27/2006. However, the abstract still contains more than 150 words.
6. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the connection via magnetic material as set forth in claim 43.

Claim Objections

7. Claims 39-43 and 45-47 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. At claim 39, line 2, it appears that "elongate" should be deleted. It is unclear if this term is fully supported by the specification.
 - b. At claim 39, last line, it appears that "pisiton" should be --position--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
9. Claims 39, 42 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blume et al. (US 6,014,580) in view of Nowlin et al. (US 6,459,926).
10. Note that Blume uses the calculations of Werp et al. (US 6,015,414) and incorporates Werp by reference (see Blume, paragraph bridging columns 6 and 7).
11. Blume discloses an apparatus for controlling movement of a tool to be inserted into the body of a patient, comprising: a controllable magnetic field source (12) having a first cluster of electromagnet poles (X+, Y- in figure 4) and a second cluster of electromagnet poles (X-, Y+), said first cluster of poles substantially opposed to said second cluster of poles; a tool (column 5, lines 18-21) having a distal end responsive to said magnetic field; one or more sensors (20) configured to sense a current position of

said distal end; and a system controller (112) for controlling said magnetic field source to control a movement of said distal end according to a feedback calculation (see formulas in column 6 of Werp) wherein said system controller is configured to compute a position error comprising a difference (error/correction vectors of Werp) between a desired position of said distal end and said current position of said distal end. In regards to claim 42, the apparatus comprises an operator interface unit (column 8, lines 7-19).

12. Although Blume discloses a Virtual Tip control device (column 8, lines 7-19), Blume does not expressly disclose that the system controller computes an amount of tactile feedback according to the position error, nor does Blume expressly disclose a Virtual Tip Calibration Fixture.

13. Nowlin teaches computing an amount of tactile feedback according to a position error (column 19, lines 23-67) so that the master and slave controllers are in corresponding positions. Furthermore, the feedback will tactilely notify a surgeon that the surgical tool has encountered resistance to movement in a desired direction (column 19, last paragraph). In regards to claim 45, Nowlin further teaches a Virtual Tip Calibration Fixture (200).

14. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the system controller of Blume to compute an amount of tactile feedback according to the position error and to have used a calibration fixture as taught by Nowlin in order to ensure that the position of the Virtual Tip

corresponds to the internal position of the tool and to notify a surgeon of resistance to movement in a particular direction.

15. Claims 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blume et al. (US 6,014,580) as modified by Nowlin et al. (US 6,459,926), as applied to claims 39, 42 and 45 above, and further in view of Solf et al. (US 6,587,709).

16. Blume as modified by Nowlin does not expressly disclose one or more piezoelectric rings.

17. Solf teaches using piezoelectric rings (10a, 10b, 10c) with an ultrasound emitter (1) for the purpose of automatically tracking a catheter tip without manual displacement of an ultrasound transducer (abstract; column 2, lines 39-46).

18. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have used piezoelectric rings as taught by Solf in the apparatus of Blume as modified by Nowlin in order to automatically and accurately track a catheter tip at all times.

19. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blume et al. (US 6,014,580) as modified by Nowlin et al. (US 6,459,926), as applied to claims 39, 42 and 45 above, and further in view of Hastings (US 6,148,823).

20. Blume as modified by Nowlin does not expressly disclose that the first cluster of poles is connected to said second cluster of poles by a magnetic material.

21. Hastings teaches that magnetic poles can be connected by magnetic material for the purpose of providing a strong field for a given magnet cost (column 3, lines 39-42).
22. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have connected the clusters of poles of Blume as modified by Nowlin with magnetic material as taught by Hastings in order to provide a stronger field for a given magnet.
23. Claims 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blume et al. (US 6,014,580) as modified by Nowlin et al. (US 6,459,926), as applied to claims 39, 42 and 45 above, and further in view of Haynor et al. (US 6,129,668) and Tanabe et al. (US 5,550,469).
24. Blume further discloses a communication controller (54). However, Blume as modified by Nowlin does not expressly disclose one or more magnetic field sensors.
25. Haynor teaches one or more Hall-effect magnetic sensors to sense a position of a tool by sensing a magnetic field produced at the tool for the purpose of obviating the need to independently verify positioning with imaging equipment (column 2, lines 42-47).
26. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have used one or more magnetic sensors as taught by Haynor in the apparatus of Blume as modified by Nowlin in order to determine the position of an indwelling tool without the need for imaging equipment.

27. Blume as modified by Nowlin and Haynor does not expressly disclose one or more temperature sensors.
28. Tanabe teaches a temperature-dependent variable resistor which is considered a temperature sensor for the purpose of compensating the temperature dependence of Hall-effect sensors (abstract). The temperature sensor is paired with magnetic sensors.
29. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have paired temperature sensors as taught by Tanabe with the Hall-effect sensors of Blume as modified by Nowlin and Haynor in order to compensate for the temperature dependence of Hall-effect sensors.

Response to Arguments

30. New rejections are set forth above in view of the recently discovered reference to Nowlin et al. (US 6,459,926).
31. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Conclusion

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Apanius whose telephone number is (571) 272-5537. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8am-4:30pm.

Art Unit: 3736

33. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on (571) 272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

34. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MA

Max Hindenburg
MAX HINDENBURG
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3736